

Appl. No. 10/719,785  
Docket No. 9432  
Amdt. dated 20 August 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed on 1 June 2007  
Customer No. 27752

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 20 2007

## REMARKS

### Claim Status

Claims 1 and 4 to 11 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

### Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1 and 4 to 11 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 13 of U.S. Patent No. 7,097,638. While neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the double patenting rejection, Applicant is filing a terminal disclaimer with this response.

Claims 1 and 4 to 11 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 9 of U.S. Patent No. 7,087,405. While neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the double patenting rejection, Applicant is filing a terminal disclaimer with this response.

Claims 1 and 4 to 11 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 9 of U.S. Patent No. 7,070,585. While neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the double patenting rejection, Applicant is filing a terminal disclaimer with this response.

Claims 1 and 4 to 11 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 19 of copending U.S. Application No. 10/719,259. While neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the double patenting rejection, Applicant is filing a terminal disclaimer with this response.

Claims 1 and 4 to 11 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 and 8 to 20 of copending U.S. Application No. 10/719,786. While neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the double patenting rejection, Applicant is filing a terminal disclaimer with this response.

Claims 1 and 4 to 11 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 12 of

Appl. No. 10/719,785  
Docket No. 9432  
Amdt. dated 20 August 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed on 1 June 2007  
Customer No. 27752

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 20 2007

copending U.S. Application No. 10/719,793. While neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the double patenting rejection, Applicant is filing a terminal disclaimer with this response.

Claims 1 and 4 to 11 have been rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 to 12 of copending U.S. Application No. 10/719,263. While neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the double patenting rejection, Applicant is filing a terminal disclaimer with this response.

Conclusion


In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the double patenting rejections. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application and allowance of Claims 1 and 4 to 11 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By

  
Signature

James E. Oehlenschlaeger

Registration No. 50,164  
(513) 634-3447

Date: 20 August 2007  
Customer No. 27752